



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,731	09/30/2004	Ricky Gene Braddy	2006579-0254 (CTX-123)	5730
69665	7590	01/06/2010	EXAMINER	
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			LANIER, BENJAMIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2432	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/06/2010	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/711,731	BRADDY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	BENJAMIN E. LANIER	2432	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/2009.

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant argues, “According to FIG. 2 of Wils, however, the flow chart clearly indicates that session determination (step 200) occurs before subscriber key verification (step 212)...” This argument is not persuasive because step 212 of figure 2 is not a subscriber **key** verification step as alleged by Applicant. Wils specifically discloses that if the session already exists, its handle will be found in the session database and the subscriber’s network access permissions **will have already been established and verified** and hence do not have to be reestablished ([0054]).

Therefore, it is clear that the access control decision is made prior to the session identification.

2. Applicant’s arguments with respect to the scenario in Wils were no sessions are identified is moot because it has been identified how Wils meets the claim limitations when sessions have been identified.

3. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13, 18-24, 26, 28-33, 36, 38, 39, 42-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599. Referring to claims 1, 5-7, 9, 30, 36, Wils discloses a partitioning of network services among multiple subscribers such that when a subscriber requests a particular resource provided by a session ([0023]), a subscriber key is used to determine what the subscriber is permitted to access ([0026]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of requesting, by a client node operated by a user, access to a resource provided by an application session, gathering information about the client node in response to the request to access the resource, receiving, by a policy engine, the gathered information, making, by a policy engine, an access control decision for the resource based on application of a policy to the received information. The subscriber database and the session database are mapped in order to determine whether the subscriber is permitted to access the requested open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client is permitted to connect, the application session from one or more application session already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. If the conditions for access to the open session are met, the subscriber is connected to

the open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of establishing, by a session server, a connection between the client node and the identified application session in response to the identification, determining if the received information satisfies a condition, determining if the received information satisfies a condition by comparing the received information to at least one condition, making an access control decision by applying a policy to the condition, establishing, by the session server, a connection between the client node and the one or more application sessions is subject to a rule permitting the client node to connect to the one or more application sessions, the identifying one or more application sessions is automatic upon receipt of authentication information. Wils does not disclose that the subscriber data that makes up the subscriber key is gathered using a collection agent. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the subscriber data of Wils to be gathered using a client-side script in order to provide resource access system that is accessible through a web browser as taught by Shrader (Col. 1, lines 16-49).

Referring to claims 2-3, Wils discloses that the request and the subscriber key are received over a network connection ([0026]), which meets the limitation of requesting the resource over a network connection, gathering the information over a network connection.

Referring to claims 4, 31-33, Wils does not disclose that the subscriber data that makes up the subscriber key is gathered using a client side script. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the subscriber data of Wils to be gathered using a client-side script in order to provide resource access system that is accessible through a web browser as taught by Shrader (Col. 1, lines 16-49).

Referring to claims 11, 38, 44, Wils discloses that after a period of time the system is requested to deactivate all sessions that have no more requests ([0074]-[0078]), which meets the limitation of receiving, by a session server, a disconnect request to disconnect a first application session associated with the user and a second application session associated with the user.

Referring to claims 12, 13, 20, 39, Wils discloses that once the sessions have been deactivated, the sessions are put on the inactive list ([0074]), which meets the limitation of updating, by the session server, at least one data record associated with the first and second application session to indicate that the first and second application sessions are disconnected, continuing, by the session server, execution of one or more applications for at least one of the disconnected application sessions, at least one application session is disconnected.

Referring to claims 18, 21, 23, 28, 42, 45, Wils discloses that an inactive session can be quickly reactivated if new requests are received under that session ([0023]), which meets the limitation of one or more application sessions was connected to a first client node prior to connection and, after connection, the one or more application sessions is reconnected to the first client node, at least one application session is active, providing for receiving application output from a one or more previously disconnected application sessions associated with the user in response to the received information, the one or more disconnected application sessions was connected to a first client node prior to disconnection and, at connection, the one or more disconnected application session is reconnected to the first client node.

Referring to claims 19, 29, 43, Wils discloses that grouped sessions can be allocated among active subscribers ([0039]), which meets the limitation of the one or more application sessions was associated with a first client node prior to establishing the connection and, after

establishing the connection, the one or more application sessions is connected to a second client node.

Referring to claim 24, Wils discloses that after a period of time the system is requested to deactivate all sessions that have no more requests ([0074]-[0078]), which meets the limitation of disconnecting at least one active application session associated with the user in response to the received information.

Referring to claim 26, Wils discloses that if the conditions for access to the open session are met, the subscriber is connected to the open session ([0030]-[0031]), which meets the limitation of the receipt of application output from the one or more active application sessions is subject to a rule permitting the user to have a client node operated by the user to connect to the one or more active application sessions.

7. Claims 8, 25, 35, 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599, and further in view of Maung, U.S. Publication No. 2004/0073512. Referring to claims 8, 35, 41, Wils does not disclose that the active sessions include a session from one server and a session from a different server. Maung discloses a unique session storage system wherein a plurality of servers store session information for a particular user ([0011] & [0030]), which meets the limitation of a first one of the application sessions is running on a first server and a second one of the application sessions is running on a second server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the sessions of Wils to be belong to multiple servers in order to provide load balancing which would prevent a single server from being overloaded with session requests as taught by Maung ([0012]).

Referring to claim 25, Wils does not disclose the subscriber being able to access the sessions using two different client terminals. Maung discloses a user being able to access sessions using two different client terminals ([0011]), which meets the limitation of the one or more active application sessions is initially connected to a first client node, and upon requesting access to the resource, the user is operating a second client node. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was for the subscriber of Wils to be able to access sessions using two different client terminals so that the subscriber is not limited to interacting with the same computing device for an entire session.

8. Claims 10, 27, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wils, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0004950, in view of Shrader, U.S. Patent No. 6,151,599. Referring to claims 10, 27, 37, Wils does not explicitly disclose that the subscriber request was initiated by the selection of a single user interface element. However, the Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is well known and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the subscriber of Wils with a user interface to select the requested server in order to provide a user friendly means of operating the subscriber terminal.

***Conclusion***

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN E. LANIER whose telephone number is (571)272-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin E Lanier/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2432